Case 1:09-cv-10155-SAS Document 221 Filed 09/15/11 Page 1 of 10

18izsfcc Conference 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 SOFTWARE FREEDOM CONSERVANCY, et al., 4 Plaintiffs, 5 09 CV 10155 (SAS) v. 6 BEST BUY, et al., 7 Defendants. 8 9 August 18, 2011 5:10 p.m. 10 Before: 11 12 HON. SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 DANIEL RAVICHER Attorney for Plaintiffs 16 DAVID LEICHTMAN 17 MATTHEW YANG Attorneys for Defendants 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay, do you have a sign-in sheet? Have you signed an appearance sheet?

MR. LEICHTMAN: Yes.

MR. RAVICHER: We gave it to your Clerk.

THE COURT: Okay, then it's here.

Good afternoon, Mr. Ravicher.

MR. RAVICHER: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Leichtman.

MR. LEICHTMAN: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Yang?

MR. YANG: Yes, good afternoon.

THE COURT: So since our last conference a week ago, I received a letter from Mr. Ravicher. I had asked them to consider two options; as to whether he wished to add a product that I don't think had been previously spelled out, realizing that that would extend the discovery schedule significantly and prevent the case from reaching an earlier resolution, or whether he wanted an earlier resolution on the two limited products. And then obviously one would think that people could read the handwriting on the wall and apply whatever rulings or verdicts came from those two to the remainder of the products.

He chose the former, and he said that he would like to add all these products, and he realizes that would mean that deposition -- I'm sorry -- discovery would not close till March 30th of 2012, which is a reasonably long schedule.

can't fault him for saying I want the world, and I want it done in a month. He didn't do that, he realizes, if he adds these products, it's going to extend things by many months, six or seven to be exact.

Now, I think at the last conference, Mr. Leichtman, I said, well, he's welcome to tell me which he prefers. You still have the right to oppose, so to speak, his desire to expand the case to include the products.

There are good policy reasons to allow it, in some sense, and in another sense you would say not. The benefit of allowing it is to not have a second lawsuit following the first lawsuit, starting from scratch and doing everything all over again. If he thinks there's been infringement, he's not going away, and they're not time barred. So he's going to be able to bring the case and probably as a related case. So it's coming down the road anyway. There is a certain efficiency in doing this all at one time, since his proposal as I said was somewhat reasonable in allowing discovery, maybe beneficial to Mr. Leichtman because you were barred from doing certain things that you now would be permitted to do obviously as the schedule opens up.

So that's the upside as. I suppose the downside from your point of view is we were at the end of discovery, we're about to move towards the resolution phase either by motion or by trial, and there is this open question hanging over us, we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

need a resolution. So I understand the arguments already, but go ahead and make the argument.

MR. LEICHTMAN: Thank you, your Honor. We do think in some ways it would be unfair to allow them to add these new products. And I do hear what you're saying, but I think there are -- there are two subsidiary issues. They are the -- that impact this. One is if they were to file a new case, and we were to prevail on summary judgment, there would be certain common issues.

THE COURT: Wait a minute, I'm sorry.

MR. LEICHTMAN: If we were to prevail on summary judgment here --

> Right. THE COURT:

MR. LEICHTMAN: -- there would be certain common issues which they would be collaterally estopped or possibly even res judicata prevented from raising again.

In addition to that, there are certain products -- and Mr. Ravicher was talking in generalities when we were here last time -- that we do think would be time barred if they filed a new suit. And I don't think standing here today -- you know, there are 21 different products, your Honor probably doesn't want to go through each one of them.

THE COURT: Not this afternoon. I've been on the bench all day, when I didn't expect to be on hardly at all.

> MR. LEICHTMAN: Understood.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So our point only would be that we don't think, you know, simply amending it by letter or by sending us a chart is sufficient to relate it back to the original date of the filing of complaint.

THE COURT: No, right.

MR. LEICHTMAN: And so if we do have Statute of Limitations issues, and certain damages --

THE COURT: I can deal with that.

MR. LEICHTMAN: Damages issues, we don't -- you know, that would be of a concern to us as well, as well as going through discovery, you know, on a case spending all the time and money on discovery, when there are certainly are some common issues which could be resolved by the summary judgment motions that were proposed, and then holding off to adding those products and seeing if that discovery really is necessary.

THE COURT: But Mr. Ravicher understood that too, that the rulings on some generic issues would make the case for one side or the other, and bring the whole thing to fruition earlier. And he still said I'd rather do it all in once piece. And I have to say I'm leaning that way too. As long as the discovery schedule is expanded enough that nobody's really prejudiced, as far as your issue, I think you're absolutely about the relation back. What he has to do, frankly, is amended the complaint, and I'm granting leave for him to do

that unopposed -- well, you can oppose it, but I'm going to grant it over opposition. He can amend the complaint. And then, because it's a new complaint, if you have a motion to dismiss in part based on Statute of Limitations, I can deal with that right up front.

As for the summary judgment issues, I don't know why you would want to bring them on, when this expanded discovery may reopen the opportunity for you to have the experts that you were foreclosed from having before. That's a risk Mr. Ravicher took.

MR. LEICHTMAN: Well, I think it's also, from our standpoint, under our view of this case, that it couldn't meet the burden of proof with respect to our client the way things stood where they were before today. So we were, I think, from our perspective, happy to have the summary judgment based on the record as it existed.

THE COURT: Well, that's a waste too, because then they bring the other suit, add the missing facts, we wouldn't be anywhere. The efficient way for me to deal with this, frankly, is to allow this, other than the time barred. So when can you file the amended complaint, Mr. Ravicher?

MR. RAVICHER: Well, your Honor, just one more question on that. One of the issues here is whether or not we're allowed to assert the unregistered copyrights in the program. And your Honor indicated at the conference a week and

| 181ZSICC

a half ago that you thought the law would say that we could not assert the unregistered copyrights, but that you would allow us to brief that issue.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. RAVICHER: Just to nip that whole issue in the bud, my client and I are conferring about registering all of these copyrights and all of the later versions of the program, including the exact version they include in their products. So we would like to, with your permission, amend the complaint if you think that's the most efficient way to do it. We're happy to file a brand new lawsuit with all those new registered copyrights, wherever you think is the most efficient way to do it.

THE COURT: I think the amended complaint is the best way to do it.

MR. RAVICHER: Okay, so it will just take us a few weeks because we have to confer with our client, Mr. Anderson, who is --

THE COURT: But I don't how the issue -- they still were unregistered when they were unregistered, you know what I mean. I mean, the registration kicks in as of the date of registration.

MR. RAVICHER: Actually the case law says that once the registration application has been filed, even if the copyright office hasn't yet formally acted on it.

THE COURT: Oh, for sure, that's the application date; still won't take care of the last year, for example.

MR. RAVICHER: Well, that's why I was suggesting, your Honor, we could either register those copyrights and file a brand new lawsuit with all of the products --

THE COURT: All I'm saying is I don't care whether it's a new lawsuit or amended complaint. Prior to the date of the application for registration, it wasn't registered.

MR. RAVICHER: Agreed.

THE COURT: Okay. So if you're looking for any damages, for example, for any time period that predates the application, it still was an unregistered copyright then. I can't change that, because I don't know if the issue is mooted or not.

MR. RAVICHER: We always argued that the unregistered copyrights could always seek the remedy of an injunction. We said that in our papers and that's the position we stand by.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying it doesn't matter once they're registered going forward, they're registered as preregistration period. All you want is the judgment which would you want post registration anyway.

MR. RAVICHER: Right. And any damages that occur after registration --

THE COURT: That's different.

MR. RAVICHER: -- would be --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So when can -- I'll return -- when can you file the amended complaint, since you want to register first. I don't know how long it takes you to get the applications in.

MR. RAVICHER: I would request leave for one month from today.

THE COURT: Then is the schedule you propose still intact or it does move up one month?

MR. RAVICHER: I bumped the schedule back one month then.

THE COURT: Okay. So the amended complaint would be in September 16th, and any motion directed to that complaint, which won't stay discovery, will proceed, but any motion should come in by October 14th, and any opposition to the motion is due November 11th, and reply November 28.

MR. RAVICHER: I'm not sure, that might be Thanksgiving, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, no I went to the --

That's Monday after the holiday. MR. LEICHTMAN:

THE COURT: I know. I said I went to the Monday, and I'm changing the discovery dates all of them by one month.

MR. LEICHTMAN: Your Honor, may we, just because I'm going to be away for that extended Thanksqiving weekend, can we just move that to the 30th, the Wednesday, instead of the Monday, the reply?

Case 1:09-cv-10155-SAS Document 221 Filed 09/15/11 Page 10 of 10

18izsfcc Conference THE COURT: Yes. MR. LEICHTMAN: Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. I don't think we have anything else to do today, then. MR. RAVICHER: Thank you, your Honor. (Adjourned)